

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-16 remain in this application. Claims 1 and 12 are currently amended and claims 3 and 6 were previously presented. No new matter has been added.

In this Response, Applicant amends the claims without prejudice and addresses the Examiner's rejections. Support for the amendments to the claims can be found throughout the application. Amendments to the claims are being made solely to expedite prosecution and do not constitute an acquiescence to any of the Examiner's rejections. Applicant's silence with regard to the Examiner's rejections of the dependent claims constitutes a recognition by the Applicant that the rejections are moot based on Applicant's remarks relative to the independent claim from which the dependent claims depend.

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for extending his courtesy during the telephonic interview with Applicant's representatives on August 6, 2009. During the course of the interview U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0000455 to Voutsas (hereinafter "Voutsas") was discussed as it relates to the claims. In particular, Applicant's prior amendment to the claims was discussed with reference to Figure 3 of Voutsas. Applicant's representatives took the position that Figure 3 of Voutsas illustrates successive overlapping beam pulses, as noted in Applicant's prior response. After some discussion, Applicant's representatives and the Examiner reached a tentative agreement that the claims would overcome cited art if amended to clarify that the first and second region do not overlap. Accordingly, although the Examiner indicated the acceptability of a negative claim feature, Applicant has nevertheless elected to positively recite the discussed feature, noting that the intended effect is as discussed. The Examiner further indicated he wished to conduct a further search prior to issuing a Notice of Allowance.

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1 and 3-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C.

§ 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Voutsas. Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Voutsas. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections and further submits they are moot in view of the current amendments to the claims.


Thus, for the reasons noted in Applicant's prior response and discussed with the Examiner, Applicant respectfully submits that Voutsas does not disclose or suggests at least the feature of "continuously translating the semiconductor thin film relative to the radiation beam so that a second region of the surface of the semiconductor thin film is irradiated in the same manner as in (a), wherein the second region *corresponds to a second area which is separate from a first area corresponding to the first region,*" as recited in amended independent claim 1 (emphasis added).

Amended independent claim 12 recites, *inter alia*, features similar to those discussed with reference to claim 1 and is therefore patentable over the cited art for at least the same reasons. Claims 2-11 and 13-16 all depend from either claim 1 or 12, and are also patentable over the cited art for at least the same reasons discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant believes the application to be in condition for allowance and respectfully requests the same.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant does not believe that any additional fee is required in connection with the submission of this document. However, should any fee be required, or if any overpayment has been made, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, or credit any overpayments made, to Deposit Account 02-4377.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul A. Ragusa  
Patent Office Reg. No. 38,587  
Attorney for Applicant  
(212) 408-2588

Baker Botts L.L.P.  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York NY 10112